Fusion systems of blocks with nontrivial strongly closed subgroups

Heguo Liu[1], Xingzhong Xu[1,2*], Jiping Zhang[3]

Abstract. In this paper, we find some exotic fusion systems which have nontrivial strongly closed subgroups, and we prove these fusion systems are also not realizable by p-blocks of finite groups.

Key Words: saturated fusion system, finite p-group, block
2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 20C20

arXiv:1701.01817v1 [math.GR] 7 Jan 2017

1. Introduction

To get the p-local information of finite group G, one can forget some information of this group and change the structure of a group to a category. The objects of this category are all subgroups of a given Sylow p-subgroup S of G, and the morphism set of $Q, P(\leq S)$ is the set $\mathrm{Hom}_G(Q,P) := \{c_g | Q^g \leq P\}$. This category is a saturated fusion system $\mathcal{F}_S(G)$ of finite group G over S.

Alperin's theorem for fusion systems tells us that every morphism in $\mathcal{F}_S(G)$ can be generated by some automorphisms of objects in $\mathcal{F}^{fcr}$(see theorem 2.4). So we can get all the p-local information of G from the automorphisms of objects in $\mathcal{F}^{fcr}$. The more general concept of a " saturated fusion system $\mathcal{F}$ over a finite p-group S " was introduced by Lluis Puig (See [6, 11]). Our main result is the following:

Main Theorem. *Let p be an odd prime and $P = \langle x, y, z | x^p = y^p = z^p = 1, [x,y] = z, [z,x] = [z,y] = 1\rangle \cong p_+^{1+2}$. Let $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ be a saturated fusion system over P and A respectively. Here, A is a finite abelian p-group. Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is not a fusion system of a p-block of a finite group if and only if $\mathcal{F}_1$ is not a fusion system of a p-block of a finite group.*

This theorem is motivated by Kessar's problem about fusion systems of blocks: Does the exotic fusion system is realizable by a fusion system of a block of a finite group? In [7], she had proven that the Solomon fusion system $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Sol}}(3)$ is not a fusion system of a 2-block of a finite group. In [8], they used their reduction theorem to prove that the exotic fusion systems over p_+^{1+2} do not occur as fusion systems of p-blocks of finite groups.

These exotic fusion systems which are studied in [7, 8] have no nontrivial strongly closed subgroups(see [7, Proposition 4.3(iv)],[13, Lemma 4.17]). In this paper, we fine the exotic fusion systems which have nontrivial strongly closed subgroups, and

1.Department of Mathematics, Hubei University, Wuhan 430062, China
2. Departament de Matemàtiques, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, E-08193 Bellaterra, Spain
3. School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, Beijing, 100871, China
Heguo Liu's E-mail: ghliu@hubu.edu.cn
Xingzhong Xu's E-mail: xuxingzhong407@mat.uab.cat, xuxingzhong407@126.com
$*$ Corresponding author
Jiping Zhang's E-mail: jzhang@pku.edu.cn

in Theorem 3.4, we prove these fusion systems are also not realizable by p-blocks of finite groups. In fact, our result relies on methods in [7, 8] and theory of fusion systems of blocks built in [4].

The paper is organized as follows. We start in Section 2 with the basic definitions on fusion systems, Alperin's theorem for fusion systems and factor fusion systems. In Section 3, we prove the main theorem (see Theorem 3.4).

2. **Preliminaries**

In this section we collect some known results that will be needed later. For the background theory of fusion systems, we refer to [4], [12], [14].

Definition 2.1. *A fusion system $\mathcal{F}$ over a finite p-group S is a category whose objects are the subgroups of S, and whose morphism sets $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(P,Q)$ satisfy the following two conditions:*

(a) $\mathrm{Hom}_S(P,Q) \subseteq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(P,Q) \subseteq \mathrm{Inj}(P,Q)$ for all $P,Q \leq S$.

(b) Every morphism in $\mathcal{F}$ factors as an isomorphism in $\mathcal{F}$ followed by an inclusion.

Definition 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a fusion system over a p-group S.*

- *Two subgroups P,Q are $\mathcal{F}$-conjugate if they are isomorphic as objects of the category $\mathcal{F}$. Let $P^{\mathcal{F}}$ denote the set of all subgroups of S which are $\mathcal{F}$-conjugate to P. Since $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(P,P) \subseteq \mathrm{Inj}(P,P)$, we usually write $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(P,P) = \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(P)$ and $\mathrm{Hom}_S(P,P) = \mathrm{Aut}_S(P)$.*

- *A subgroup $P \leq S$ is fully automised in $\mathcal{F}$ if $\mathrm{Aut}_S(P) \in \mathrm{Syl}_p(\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(P))$.*

- *A subgroup $P \leq S$ is receptive in $\mathcal{F}$ if it has the following property: for each $Q \leq S$ and each $\varphi \in \mathrm{Iso}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q,P)$, if we set*

$$N_\varphi = \{g \in N_S(Q) | \varphi \circ c_g \circ \varphi^{-1} \in \mathrm{Aut}_S(P)\},$$

then there is $\overline{\varphi} \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(N_\varphi, S)$ such that $\overline{\varphi}|_Q = \varphi$. (where $c_g : x \longmapsto g^{-1}xg$ for $g \in S$)

- *A fusion system $\mathcal{F}$ over a p-group S is saturated if each subgroup of S is $\mathcal{F}$-conjugate to a subgroup which is fully automised and receptive. This definition is due to* [12].

Definition 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a fusion system over a p-group S.*

- *A subgroup $P \leq S$ is fully centralised in $\mathcal{F}$ if $|C_S(P)| \geq |C_S(Q)|$ for all $Q \in P^{\mathcal{F}}$.*

- *A subgroup $P \leq S$ is fully normalised in $\mathcal{F}$ if $|N_S(P)| \geq |N_S(Q)|$ for all $Q \in P^{\mathcal{F}}$.*

- *A subgroup $P \leq S$ is $\mathcal{F}$-centric if $C_S(Q) = Z(Q)$ for $Q \in P^{\mathcal{F}}$.*

- *A subgroup $P \leq S$ is $\mathcal{F}$-radical if $\mathrm{Out}_{\mathcal{F}}(P) = \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(P)/\mathrm{Inn}(P)$ is p-reduced; i.e., if $O_p(\mathrm{Out}_{\mathcal{F}}(P)) = 1$.*

- *Let $\mathcal{F}^r, \mathcal{F}^c, \mathcal{F}^f$ denote the full subcategories whose objects are $\mathcal{F}$-radical, $\mathcal{F}$-centric, and fully normalised in $\mathcal{F}$ respectively. Let $\mathcal{F}^{fcr} = \mathcal{F}^f \cap \mathcal{F}^c \cap \mathcal{F}^r$ and $\mathcal{F}^{cr} = \mathcal{F}^c \cap \mathcal{F}^r$.*

• *A subgroup $P \leq S$ is normal in $\mathcal{F}$ (denoted $P \trianglelefteq \mathcal{F}$) if for all $Q, R \in S$ and all $\varphi \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q, R)$, φ extends to a morphism $\overline{\varphi} \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(QP, RP)$ such that $(P)\overline{\varphi} = P$.*

• *A subgroup $P \leq S$ is strongly closed in $\mathcal{F}$ if no element of P is $\mathcal{F}$-conjugate to an element of $S - P$.*

Definition 2.4. *A saturated fusion system $\mathcal{F}$ over a p-group S will be called realizable if $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_S(G)$ for some finite group G with $S \in \mathrm{Syl}_p(G)$, and will be called exotic otherwise.*

Theorem 2.5. *(Alperin's theorem for fusion systems). Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a saturated fusion system over a p-group S. Then for each morphism $\varphi \in \mathrm{Iso}_{\mathcal{F}}(P, R)$ in $\mathcal{F}$, there exist sequences of subgroups of S*

$$P = P_0, P_1, \ldots, P_k = R, \text{ and } Q_1, Q_2, \ldots, Q_k,$$

and morphism $\psi_i \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(Q_i)$, such that

(a) Q_i is fully normalised in $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{F}$-radical, and $\mathcal{F}$-centric for each i(that is $Q_i \in \mathcal{F}^{fcr}$);

(b) $P_{i-1}, P_i \leq Q_i$ and $\psi_i(P_{i-1}) = P_i$ for each i; and

(c) $\psi = \psi_k \circ \psi_{k-1} \circ \cdots \circ \psi_1$.

The following is devoted to recalling the basic definitions of factor fusion systems, we refer to [2],[4].

Definition 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a saturated fusion system over a p-group S, and fix $Q \leq S$ and $K \leq \mathrm{Aut}(Q)$. Let $N_{\mathcal{F}}^K(Q) \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be the fusion system over $N_S^K(Q)$ where $P, R \leq N_S^K(Q)$,*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{N_{\mathcal{F}}^K(Q)}(P, R) = \{\varphi \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(P, R) | \exists\ \overline{\varphi} \in \varphi \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(PQ, RQ)$$
$$\text{with } \overline{\varphi}|_P = \varphi, \overline{\varphi}(Q) = Q, \text{ and } \overline{\varphi}|_Q \in K\}.$$

As special cases, set $N_{\mathcal{F}}(Q) = N_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathrm{Aut}(Q)}(Q)$ and $C_{\mathcal{F}}(Q) = N_{\mathcal{F}}^{\{1\}}(Q)$. If Q is fully K-normalized in $\mathcal{F}$, then $N_{\mathcal{F}}^K(Q)$ is a saturated fusion system.

Definition 2.7. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a saturated fusion system over a p-group S, T a strongly closed in S with respect to $\mathcal{F}$, and $\mathcal{N} = N_{\mathcal{F}}(T)$.*

• *Set $S^+ = S/T$ and $\theta : S \longrightarrow S^+$ be the natural map $\theta : x \longrightarrow x^+ = xT \in S^+$.*

• *We define a category $\mathcal{F}/T$: $\mathcal{F}/T$ and a morphism $\theta : \mathcal{N} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}/T$. The objects of $\mathcal{F}/T$ are the subgroups of S^+. For $P \leq S$ and $\alpha \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{N}}(P, S)$ define $\alpha^+ : P^+ \longrightarrow S^+$ by $\alpha^+(x^+) = \alpha(x)^+$. This is well defined as T a strongly closed in S with respect to $\mathcal{F}$. Now define*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}/T}(P^+, S^+) = \{\beta^+ | \beta \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{N}}(PT, S)\}.$$

and define $\theta_P : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{N}}(P, S) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}/T}(P^+, S^+)$ by $\theta_P(\alpha) = \alpha^+$. For $\alpha \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{N}}(P, S)$, α extends to $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{N}}(PT, S)$ and $\hat{\alpha}^+ = \alpha^+$, so θ_P is well defined and surjective.

We next look at the definition of products of fusion systems(see [3, 6]).

Definition 2.8. *Let $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ be a saturated fusion system over finite p-groups S_1 and S_2 respectively. $\mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2$ is fusion system over $S_1 \times S_2$ generated by the set of all $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \mathrm{Hom}(P_1 \times P_2, Q_1 \times Q_2)$ for $\varphi_i \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{F}}(P_i, Q_i)$.*

Remark 2.9. *Let $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ be a saturated fusion system over S_1 and S_2 respectively. Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2$. Then $\mathcal{F}/S_1 \cong C_{\mathcal{F}}(S_1)/S_1 \cong \mathcal{F}_2$.*

3. **Proof of the Main theorem**

For sake of completeness, we recall the theory of fusion systems of blocks(see [4, Part IV]).

Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic p, G a finite group and b a block of kG, that is b is a primitive idempotent of $Z(kG)$. For any p-subgroup Q of G the canonical projection from kN to $kC_G(Q)$ induces an algebra morphism Br_Q^{kG} from the subalgebra of fixed points of Q, $(kG)^Q$ onto $kC_G(Q)$(see [4, 5]). This morphism is known in the literature as Brauer morphism.

A (kG, b, G)-Brauer pair is a pair (Q, e_Q) where Q is a p-subgroup of G such that $\mathrm{Br}_Q^{kG}(b) \neq 0$ and e_Q is a block of $kC_G(Q)$ such that $\mathrm{Br}_Q^{kG}(b)e_Q \neq 0$. Let $(Q, e_Q), (R, e_R)$ be (kG, b, G)-Brauer pair. We say that (Q, e_Q) is contained in (R, e_R) if $Q \leq R$ and for any primitive idempotent $i \in (kG)^R$ such that $\mathrm{Br}_Q^{kG}(i)e_R \neq 0$, we have $\mathrm{Br}_Q^{kG}(i)e_Q \neq 0$. Here, we write $(Q, e_Q) \leq (R, e_R)$. Recall [4, 5], we know that

(1) Given a (kG, b, G)-Brauer pair (R, e_R) and $Q \leq R$, there exists a unique (c, G)-Brauer pair (Q, e_Q) contained in (R, e_R).

(2) All maximal (kG, b, G)-Brauer pair are G-conjugate.

Definition 3.1. *Let $Q \leq P$ be p-subgroups of G.*

- *Define*
$$\mathrm{Br}_{P,Q}^{kG} : \mathrm{Br}_Q^{kG}((kG)^P) \to kC_G(P)$$
by $\mathrm{Br}_{P,Q}^{kG}(\mathrm{Br}_Q^{kG}(a)) = \mathrm{Br}_P^{kG}(a)$ for $a \in (kG)^P$. If e_Q is a block of $kC_G(Q)$ and e_Q is P-stable, then $\mathrm{Br}_{P,Q}^{kG}(\mathrm{Br}_Q^{kG}(e_Q)) = \mathrm{Br}_{P,Q}^{kG}(e_Q) = \mathrm{Br}_P^{kG}(e_Q) = e_Q$.

- *Let $(Q, e_Q), (P, e_P)$ be (kG, b, G)-Brauer pair. We write that $(Q, e_Q) \trianglelefteq (P, e_P)$ if Q is a normal subgroup of P, e_Q is P-stable and $\mathrm{Br}_{P,Q}^{kG}(\mathrm{Br}_Q^{kG}(e_Q))e_P = e_P$. That is $e_Q e_P = e_P$.*

- *For a (kG, b, G)-Brauer pair (Q, e_Q), let us denote by $N_G(Q, e_Q)$the stabilizer in $N_G(Q)$ of e_Q.*

For further standard notation and terminology, we follow [4], [10].

Definition 3.2. *Let (S, e_S) is the maximal (kG, b, G)-Brauer pair. For each $Q \leq S$, let e_Q denote the unique block of $kC_G(Q)$ such that $(Q, e_Q) \leq (S, e_S)$. The fusion category of (kG, b, G) over S, e_S is the category $\mathcal{F}_{(S,e_S)}(kG, b, G)$ whose objects are the subgroups of S and which has morphism sets*
$$\mathrm{Mor}_{\mathcal{F}_{(S,e_S)}(kG,b,G)}(Q, R) = \mathrm{Hom}_G((Q, e_Q), (R, e_R))$$
for $Q, R \leq S$ (see [4, Part IV, Defintion 2.21]*).*

Definition 3.3. *If an abstract fusion system $\mathcal{F} \cong \mathcal{F}_{(S,e_S)}(kG, b, G)$, we say that fusion system $\mathcal{F}$ is block realizable. By Brauer's Third Main Theorem, any realizable saturated fusion system is block realizable. Moreover, if $\mathcal{F}$ is not block realizable, then $\mathcal{F}$ is exotic.* (*see* [4, Part IV, p. 221]).

Theorem 3.4. *Let p be an odd prime and $P = \langle x, y, z | x^p = y^p = z^p = 1, [x, y] = z, [z, x] = [z, y] = 1\rangle \cong p_+^{1+2}$. Let $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$ be a saturated fusion system over P and A respectively. Here, A is a finite abelian p-group. Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is not a fusion system of a p-block of a finite group if and only if $\mathcal{F}_1$ is not a fusion system of a p-block of a finite group.*

Proof. Let $S := P \times A$. Suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ is a fusion system of a p-block of a finite group, we can set $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{(S,e_S)}(kG, b, G)$ where G is a finite group, b is a block of G, and (S, e_S) is a maximal (kG, b, G)-Brauer pair.

Since $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2$, we have A is strongly closed in $\mathcal{F}$. Let (A, e_A) be a (kG, b, G)-Brauer pair such that $(A, e_A) \leq (S, e_S)$. By [4, Part IV, Proposition 3.19(b)], we have

$$C_{\mathcal{F}}(A) = N_{\mathcal{F}}^{K}(A) = \mathcal{F}_{(S,e_S)}(kC_G(A), e_A, C_G(A))$$

by [4, Part IV, Proposition 3.8]. Here, $K = \mathrm{Aut}_{C_G(A)}(A) = \{\mathrm{Id}_A\}$.

By Definition 2.7, we have $C_{\mathcal{F}}(A)/A \cong \mathcal{F}/A \cong \mathcal{F}_1$. Since A is abelian, we have $A \leq C_G(A)$. As before, we denote by μ_A the natural k-algebra homomorphism

$$\mu_A : kC_G(A) \longrightarrow k(C_G(A)/A)$$
$$\sum_x \lambda_x x \longmapsto \sum_x \lambda_x \overline{x},$$

where $\overline{x} = xA \in C_G(A)/A$. As e_A is a block of $kC_G(A)$ and $|C_G(A) : C_{C_G(A)}(A)| = 1$, then $\overline{e}_A := \mu(e_A)$ is a block of $k(C_G(A)/A)$ by [10, Ch. 5, Theorem 8.11].

In the following, we will check that

$$C_{\mathcal{F}}(A)/A \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{(S/A,\overline{\varepsilon}_S)}(kC_G(A)/A, \overline{e}_A, C_G(A)/A).$$

Here, $\overline{\varepsilon}_S$ will be defined in the following text.

First, we will prove that there is an $C_G(A)$-poset equivalence between the subset of $(kC_G(A), e_A, C_G(A))$-Brauer pairs consisting of those pairs who contains (A, e_A), and the subset of $(kC_G(A)/A, \overline{e}_A, C_G(A)/A)$-Brauer pairs by the map Φ

$$(T, e_T) \longmapsto \Phi(T, e_T).$$

Here, (T, e_T) is a $(kC_G(A), e_A, C_G(A))$-Brauer pair such that $(T, e_T) \leq (S, e_S)$. We will define the $\Phi(T, e_T)$ in the following.

Since $A \trianglelefteq T \leq S$, set $\overline{T} = T/A$. It is easy to see that $C_G(T)/A \leq C_{C_G(A)/A}(\overline{T})$, we can set that $C_{C_G(A)/A}(\overline{T}) = L_T/A$. Here, $L_T \leq C_G(A)$ and $C_G(T) \trianglelefteq L_T$. Since L_T acts on T/A and A trivially, we have $L_T/C_G(T)$ is a p-group by [4, Appendix A, Lemma A.2]. Since (T, e_T) is a $(kC_G(A), e_A, C_G(A))$-Brauer pair, thus (T, e_T) is also a (kG, b, G)-Brauer pair by [4, Part IV, Lemma 3.5]. That is e_T is a block of $kC_{C_G(A)}(T) = kC_G(T)$. Then there exists a unique block ε_T of kL_T such that ε_T covers e_T by [10, Ch.5, Corollary 5.6].

Set $\overline{\varepsilon}_T := \mu_A(\varepsilon_T)$, since $L_T/C_G(T)$ is a p-group, thus $|L_T : C_{L_T}(T)|$ is power of prime. As $C_{L_T}(T) \leq C_{L_T}(A)$, we can see that $|L_T : C_{L_T}(A)|$ is power of prime. Hence $\overline{\varepsilon}_T := \mu_A(\varepsilon_T)$ is a block of $k(L_T/A) = kC_{C_G(A)/A}(\overline{T})$ by [10, Ch. 5, Theorem 8.11].

Since (T, e_T) is a $(kC_G(A), e_A, C_G(A))$-Brauer pair, thus $\mathrm{Br}_T^{kC_G(A)}(e_A)e_T \neq 0$. As e_T is covered by a unique ε_T, it implies that $\mathrm{Br}_T^{kC_G(A)}(e_A) \cdot \varepsilon_T \neq 0$. Since $A \trianglelefteq C_G(A)$, we have $\mathrm{Ker}\mu_A \subseteq J(kC_G(A))$ by [10, Ch.5, Lemma 2.7]. So $\mu_C(\mathrm{Br}_T^{kC_G(A)}(e_A)\varepsilon_T) \neq 0$. Also $\overline{e}_A := \mu_A(e_A)$ is a block of $kC_G(A)$ and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (kC_G(A))^T & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Br}_T^{kC_G(A)}} & kC_G(T) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mu_A} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mu_A} \\ (kC_G(A)/A)^{\overline{T}} & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{Br}_{\overline{T}}]{} & kC_{C_G(A)/A}(\overline{T}) \end{array}$$

commutes, thus

$$\mu_A(\mathrm{Br}_T^{kC_G(A)}(e_A)) = \mathrm{Br}_{\overline{T}}^{kC_G(A)/A}(\overline{e}_A).$$

Hence $\mathrm{Br}_{\overline{T}}^{kC_G(A)/A}(\overline{e}_A)\overline{\varepsilon}_T \neq 0$. Therefore, $(\overline{T}, \overline{\varepsilon}_T)$ is a $(kC_G(A)/A, \overline{e}_A, C_G(A)/A)$-Brauer pair. So we can define $\Phi(T, e_T) = (\overline{T}, \overline{\varepsilon}_T)$ and Φ is injective.

We show that the map Φ is inclusion preserving. By [4, Part IV, Proposition 2.14], we only need to prove it when $(A, e_A) \leq (R, e_R) \trianglelefteq (T, e_T)$. So we have $R \trianglelefteq T$, $\mathrm{Br}_{T,R}^{kC_G(A)}(e_R)e_T = e_T$ and e_R is T-stable. That is $e_R e_T = e_T$. Hence $\varepsilon_R\varepsilon_T \neq 0$ because $\varepsilon_R, \varepsilon_T$ cover e_R, e_T respectively. Now, we can see that $0 \neq \mu_A(\varepsilon_R\varepsilon_T) = \overline{\varepsilon}_R\overline{\varepsilon}_T$. Also let $t \in T$, ε_R^t is a block of kL_R because T acts on L_R. (Here, the definition of L_R like L_T above.) But there exists a unique block ε_R of kL_R such that ε_R covers e_R, thus $\varepsilon_R^t = \varepsilon_R$ because ε_R^t covers $e_R^t = e_R$. (Here, e_R is T-stable.) Hence $\overline{\varepsilon}_R$ is $\overline{T}$-stable. Therefore, $(\overline{R}, \overline{\varepsilon}_R) \trianglelefteq (\overline{T}, \overline{\varepsilon}_T)$, that means $\Phi(R, e_R) \trianglelefteq \Phi(T, e_T)$. So Φ is a poset bijection.

Let $g \in C_G(A)$, we have $\Phi(T, e_T)^g = (\overline{T}, \overline{\varepsilon}_T)^g = (\overline{T}^g, \overline{\varepsilon}_T^g)$. Since ε_T cover e_T, thus ε_T^g covers e_T^g. Here, $\mu_A(\varepsilon_T)^g = \mu_A(\varepsilon_T^g)$. That is $\Phi(T, e_T)^g = \Phi(T^g, e_T^g)$. Hence Φ is compatible with $C_G(A)$-action.

Now, we will prove that $(\overline{S}, \overline{\varepsilon}_S)$ is a maximal $(kC_G(A)/A, \overline{e}_A, C_G(A)/A)$-Brauer pair.

Suppose that there exists a $(kC_G(A)/A, \overline{e}_A, C_G(A)/A)$-Brauer pair $(R/A, \overline{\varepsilon}_R) \gneq (\overline{S}, \overline{\varepsilon}_S)$. Hence, $R \gneq S$ and $\mathrm{Br}_{R/A}^{kC_G(A)/A}(\overline{e}_A)\overline{\varepsilon}_R \neq 0$. So $\mathrm{Br}_R^{kC_G(A)}(e_A)\varepsilon_R \neq 0$. There exists a block e_R of $kC_G(R)$ such that ε_R covers e_R and $\mathrm{Br}_R^{kC_G(A)}(e_A)e_R \neq 0$. So (R, e_R) is a $(kC_G(A), e_A, C_G(A))$-Brauer pair. By [4, Part IV, Lemma 3.5], we have (R, e_R) is a (kG, b, G)-Brauer pair. That is a contradiction. Hence $(\overline{S}, \overline{\varepsilon}_S)$ is a maximal $(kC_G(A)/A, \overline{e}_A, C_G(A)/A)$-Brauer pair. So we can see that Φ is surjective.

By [4, Part IV, Proposition 3.2], we have $\mathcal{F}_{(S/A, \overline{\varepsilon}_S)}(kC_G(A)/A, \overline{e}_A, C_G(A)/A)$ is a saturated fusion system over S/A.

Second, let $A \leq R \leq S$, we can see that

$$N_{C_G(A)}(R, e_R)/A \leq N_{C_G(A)/A}(\overline{R}, \overline{\varepsilon}_R).$$

That is

$$C_{\mathcal{F}}(A)/A \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{(S/A, \overline{\varepsilon}_S)}(kC_G(A)/A, \overline{e}_A, C_G(A)/A).$$

Since $C_{\mathcal{F}}(A)/A$ is a saturated fusion system over $S/A \cong p_+^{1+2}$, if $C_{\mathcal{F}}(A)/A$ is not a fusion system of a p-block of a finite group, then $C_{\mathcal{F}}(A)/A$ is one of the following saturated fusion systems:

Name	$\mathrm{Out}_{\mathcal{F}}(7_+^{1+2})$	$\lvert\mathcal{F}^{cr}\rvert$	$\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(V)$
RV_1	$6^2 : 2$	$6 + 2$	$\mathrm{SL}_2(7) : 2, \mathrm{GL}_2(7)$
RV_2	$D_{16} \times 3$	$4 + 4$	$\mathrm{SL}_2(7) : 2, \mathrm{SL}_2(7) : 2$
RV_3	$SD_{32} \times 3$	8	$\mathrm{SL}_2(7) : 2$

by [8]. And this table also can be fined from [13, Lemma 4.17].

Here, $C_{\mathcal{F}}(A)/A \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{(S/A, \overline{\varepsilon}_S)}(kC_G(A)/A, \overline{e}_A, C_G(A)/A)$. Hence either

$$C_{\mathcal{F}}(A)/A = \mathcal{F}_{(S/A, \overline{\varepsilon}_S)}(kC_G(A)/A, \overline{e}_A, C_G(A)/A),$$

or $C_{\mathcal{F}}(A)/A \cong RV_2$ and $\mathcal{F}_{(S/A, \overline{\varepsilon}_S)}(kC_G(A)/A, \overline{e}_A, C_G(A)/A) \cong RV_3$ by [8, 13].

However, RV_1, RV_2, RV_3 are not fusion systems of a p-blocks of finite groups. That is a contradiction. Hence, $C_{\mathcal{F}}(A)/A \cong \mathcal{F}_1$ is a fusion system of a p-block of a finite group.

Conversely suppose that $\mathcal{F}_1$ is a fusion system of a p-block of a finite group. Since $P \cong p_+^{1+2}$, we have that $\mathcal{F}_1$ is not exotic by [8, Theorem 6.4]. Let $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_P(G_1)$ for a finite group G_1 with $P \in \mathrm{Syl}_p(G_1)$. Set $G = G_1 \times (A \rtimes \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{F}}(A))$, then $P \times A \in \mathrm{Syl}_p(G)$. So $\mathcal{F} \cong \mathcal{F}_{P\times A}(G)$. That is $\mathcal{F}$ is a fusion system of a p-block of a finite group. □

References

[1] J. Alperin, M. Broué, Local methods in block theory, Ann. of Math. 110(1979) 143-157.

[2] M. Aschbacher, Normal subsystems of fusion systems, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. 97(2008) 239-271

[3] M. Aschbacher, The generalized Fitting subsystem of a fusion system, Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc. 209 (2011), no. 986.

[4] M. Aschbacher, R. Kessar, and B. Oliver, Fusion systems in algebra and topology, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series 391, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011.

[5] M. Broué, L. Puig, Charaters and local structures in G-algebra, J. Algebra 63(1980), 306-317.

[6] C. Broto, R. Levi, B. Oliver, The homotopy theory of fusion systems, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 16 (2003), 779-856.

[7] R. Kessar, The Solomon fusion system $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Sol}}(3)$ does not occur as fusion system of a 2-block, J. Algebra 296(2006), 409-425.

[8] R. Kessar, R. Stancu, A reduction theorem for fusion systems of blocks, J. Algebra 319(2008), 806-823.

[9] R. Levi, B. Oliver, Construction of 2-local finite groups of a type studied by Solomon and Benson, Geometry and Topology 6 (2002), 917-990.

[10] H. Nagao, Y. Tsushima, Representations of finite groups, Academic Press, Boston, 1988.

[11] L. Puig, Structure locale dans les groupes finis, Bul. Soc. Math. France, Mémoire no. 47, PH thesis (1976).

[12] K. Roberts, S. Shpectorov, On the definition of saturated fusion systems, J. Group Theory 12 (2009), 679-687.

[13] A. Ruiz, A. Viruel, The classification of p-local finite groups over the extraspecial group of order p^3 and exponent p, Math. Z. 248 (2004), 45-65.

[14] R. Stancu, Control of fusion in fusion systems, J. Algebra and its Applications. 5(6) (2006), 817-837.